

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

CURTIS LAMAR KIMBROUGH,

Defendant and Appellant.

E060389

(Super.Ct.No. FBA1300092)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of San Bernardino County. John P. Vander Feer, Judge. Affirmed.

Cindi B. Mishkin, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

The trial court ordered defendant to serve the remaining term of his two-year county prison sentence for forgery after he admitted to violating his mandatory supervision by committing a new crime. He challenges this order, but we affirm it.

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On June 14, 2013, defendant pled guilty to forgery (Pen. Code § 470, subd. (a)) in exchange for an agreed-to two-year county prison split sentence. The trial court ordered defendant to serve an initial term of 120 days (60 days actual and 60 days conduct credit), with 20 months suspended, followed by release on mandatory supervision.

On December 9, 2013, defendant admitted that he violated the terms of his mandatory supervision by possessing or receiving stolen property. In exchange, the court ordered him to serve the remainder of the two-year county prison sentence and dismissed his new stolen property case, FVI1303835. Defendant appealed.

DISCUSSION

We appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. After examination of the record, counsel has filed a brief under the authority of *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, setting forth a statement of the case, a summary of the facts and potential arguable issues, and requesting this court conduct an independent review of the record. We offered defendant an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief, but he has not done so.

Pursuant to the mandate of *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, we have independently reviewed the record for potential error and find no arguable issues.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

RAMIREZ
P. J.

We concur:

HOLLENHORST
J.

RICHLI
J.